



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,988	09/18/2006	Philips Steven Newton	NL 040286	3013

24737 7590 04/12/2010
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

MCADAMS, BRAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2456

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/12/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte PHILIPS STEVEN NEWTON and DECLAN PATRICK KELLY

Appeal 2009-014203
Application 10/598,988
Technology Center 2400

Mailed: April 12, 2010

Before DALE M. SHAW, *Division 2 Support Administrator*

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on August 17, 2009. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No 2009-014203 was assigned on November 12, 2009. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Claims 7 and 8 of the instant application contain functional language that may be indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. . *See Ex Parte Rodriguez*, 2009 WL 3756279 (BPAI 2009) and *Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty. Ltd. v. It'l. Game Tech.*, 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed Cir. 2008). On September 2, 2008 the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, when examining means (or step) plus function claim limitations under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph”, located at: http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/section_112_6th_09_02_2008.pdf . Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 7 and 8 and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of being definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 7 and 8 and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DMS/kme

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR NY 10510